

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL BOSCHETTI,

No. C 13-0628 CW

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
TO SEAL (Docket  
No. 11)

DANIEL O'BLENIS,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
TO SEAL (Docket  
No. 11)

On April 4, 2013, Defendant Daniel Everett, proceeding pro  
se, filed a motion to seal the entire docket in this case. He did  
not, however, provide a declaration establishing that every  
document in this case is sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5.<sup>2</sup>  
Under that rule, the Court may only order a document to be sealed  
if it "is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise  
entitled to protection under the law." Civil Local Rule 79-5(a).  
While Defendant alleges that the San Francisco County Superior  
Court -- where this action was originally filed -- previously  
granted the parties' joint request to seal this case, that order  
is not binding on this Court.

If Defendant wishes to seal documents filed after he removed this case from state court, then he must file a motion to seal and accompanying declaration establishing that those documents are

<sup>1</sup> Although Defendant is named in this action as Daniel O'Blevins, he has identified himself as Daniel Everett in his motion.

<sup>2</sup> Defendant filed this motion under section 1161.2 of the California Rules of Civil Procedure. However, as noted above, sealing motions in this Court are governed by Civil Local Rule 79-5.

1 sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5(a). Because he has not done  
2 so here, his motion to seal (Docket No. 11) is DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
4

5 Dated: 4/8/2013  
6

  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge